UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,581	07/15/2003	Ekambaram Balaji	030773/2868P	8889

7590 04/14/2008

Sandeep Jaggi
LSI Logic Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
1551 McCarthy Blvd., M/S D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER
PRICE, NATHAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

    A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
         application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are pending.

2.   This Office Action is in response to communications received 09 January 2008.
Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been
withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 09 January 2008 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive.

4.   Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach providing an adapter API used to
translate data as claimed in step (a) of claim 31. Examiner respectfully disagrees.
Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (¶127).

5.   Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach data sources are stored in different
formats and are not directly accessible by other client applications as claimed.
Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the client applications can be based
on Java or non-Java systems and can operate on any platform, which teaches or at
least suggests the clients use different formats such that the data sources are not
directly accessible by other client applications (¶37).

6.   Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach modifying client applications to invoke methods of the API. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs are pluggable, which teaches modifying the client applications to invoke methods of the API (¶115, 127).

7.   Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the API at the client using a registered schema definition to convert the data as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (¶127) and use of registered schema definition to convert the data (¶72, 130).

8.   Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach submitting the XML files to an import repository at a server and storing data in a database as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Initially, use of the same terms ("import repository" and "database") is not necessary for a reference to teach the same functionality. Sharma teaches or suggests submitting XML files to an import repository by teaching the server can act as a file server (¶5). Sharma further teaches or suggests the XML files are parsed and stored in a database by teaching an XML parser and that the server can act as a file server, which would include the database (¶5, 173). Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the import repository and database as being separate, but the claim does not appear to specify that the repository does not contain the database.

9.   Regarding the other claims and cited references, Applicant appears to rely on the

arguments that have been addressed above to argue that limitations are not taught by

the combination of references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645 A1; hereinafter

Sharma) in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174 B2; hereinafter Chiang) and Fry (US

6,880,125 B2).

11.   As to claim 31, Sharma teaches a method for providing data integration and

exchange between a plurality of client applications over a network, wherein each of the

client applications access a respective data source (¶ 5, 65, 115), the method

comprising:

(a) providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first

set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data

sources into XML format, wherein the data sources of each of the client applications are

stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by the other client applications

(Fig. 5; ¶ 5, 8 – 10, 37, 115, 127);

(b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in

the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format

according to a registered schema definition (¶ 7, 72, 91, 115, 127, 130);

(c) submitting each of the XML files to an import repository at a server (¶ 5, 115,

127); and

(e) parsing the validated XML files in the import repository and storing

name/value pairs in a database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the

corresponding DTD, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources of the client

applications (¶ 7, 55 – 56, 127, 173).

12.   Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data from the

respective data sources in XML files. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format

data in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine

these references because both disclose converting data to XML in order to provide

compatibility between different systems.

13.   Sharma fails to specifically teach validation as claimed. However, Fry teaches

validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a document

type definition (DTD) corresponding to the respective data sources (col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Sharma teaches that a streaming parser can be used (¶ 123) and Fry provides further information on parsers, including streaming parsers (col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

14. As to claim 2, Sharma teaches including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services (¶ 5, 28, 115, 127);

15. As to claim 3, Sharma teaches registering the respective data sources with a schema registry in order to create the schema definition and the DTD (¶ 7, 72, 91,130).

16. As to claim 6, Sharma teaches the adapter API includes an XML API comprising the first set of methods and the second set of methods, wherein the first set of methods comprises a Writer API and the second set comprises a Reader API (¶ 5, 115, 155, 173).

17. As to claim 7, Sharma teaches that the client applications are modified with generator logic that makes calls to methods comprising the adapter API, wherein once called, the Writer API converts data into the XML format in memory and transports the

data to the server (¶ 115, 155, 173). Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the

XML format data in an XML file. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data

in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46).

18.   As to claim 9, Sharma fails to specifically teach verification as claimed. However,

Fry teaches wherein the adapter further includes verification code that verifies the

generated XML data against the DTD defined in the schema registry (col. 2 lines 61 -

65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

19.   As to claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 32 and 33, see the rejection of claims 31,

2, 3, 6, 7 and 9.

20.   As to claim 28, Sharma teaches that the server further includes a schema

generator for generating the schema definition, a DTD generator for generating the

DTD, and an adapter software kit that is downloaded from the server and used to

incorporate the adapter API into the client applications (¶ 7, 27, 72, 109).

Conclusion

21.   The prior art made of record on the P.T.O. 892 that has not been relied upon is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of the cited art is

required prior to responding to this Office Action, see 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

22.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to NATHAN PRICE whose telephone number is (571)272-

4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 2:30pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

/Li B. Zhen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194